

MINUTES OF THE MEETING E-COM+45. MONDAY AND TUESDAY, THE 12^H AND THE 13TH APRIL 2010. E-SENIORS ASSOCIATION, PARIS

Nota Bene: These minutes are complementary to the ppt. file showed in the meeting. Please, take into consideration both documents, the presentation and the minutes to have a more complete idea of the decisions of the meeting.

The meeting is held in Paris, 52, rue René Boulanger.

Participants:

<i>Name</i>	<i>Organisation</i>	<i>Country</i>
José Jesus Delgado Peña	University of Malaga	Spain
Maria Teresa Vera Balanza	University of Malaga	Spain
Natalia Meléndez Malavé	University of Malaga	Spain
Purificación Subires Mancera	University of Malaga	Spain
Carmen Romo Parra	University of Malaga	Spain
Andrés Tello Romero	Aula de Mayores UMA	Spain
Angel Pulla Dijort	Aula de Mayores UMA	Spain
Tanya Tsonkova	Intelekti	Bulgaria
Milena Mincheva	Intelekti	Bulgaria
Valentin Boychev	Intelekti	Bulgaria
Eero Elenurm	YSBF	Estonia
Andrea Kövesd	Net Mex	Hungary
Priszilla Várnagy	Net Mex	Hungary
Gabriella Pappadà	FNP-CISL	Italy
Marco Brugnola	FNP-CISL	Italy
Monique Epstein	E-Seniors	France
Frédéric Constans	E-Seniors	France
Philippe Uziel	E-Seniors	France
Ganit Hirschberg	E-Seniors	France

MONDAY, APRIL THE 12TH 2010

Monique Epstein welcomes the participants and opens the meeting. Upon request from Jesus Delgado she makes a comprehensive presentation encompassing of E-Seniors' activities, particularly those in the field of elderly people empowerment with the use of ICTs (this presentation will be available in our virtual space).

At the end of the presentation, Jesus Delgado mentions a modification in the meeting's agenda, for logistical reasons.

Agenda item "Results of the questionnaire analysis"

Jesus Delgado reminds the project objectives to the participants.

Further to the survey already carried out by the participating partners, he mentions the need for a short report comparing the situations with the various partners and he calls for an uniform presentation of the statistical results, stating that the 'analysis by age' statistics need to be changed. Suggestions are made in the group to adopt an 'age pyramid' approach to such graphics. Another graphics (10, 13 and 17) will be improved by the Spanish team in the next weeks.

He also asks for the similarity of graphics per country in Europe. At this point, Eero Elenurm mentions that several choices are available and asks how to include them in the model.

It is decided by the group that "free answers", ie. those with free text, not included in a multiple choice mode question, have to remain in local language.

Concerning crossed data (sex and age), the group recommends two pyramids.

The participants decide that it is interesting crossing the following criteria {gender (1), age (3), live alone (4)} with {ICT at home (10), use of PC (13), use of Internet (14)}. (1), (3) and (4) will be also crossed with (17) range from 1 to 5. Using the SPSS software package has been envisaged but not decided because of complexity and cost reasons.

As regards country to country local comparisons, the following is required:

- An analysis of the overall results (all institutions together) covering
 - a. general data
 - b. uses of ICTs by 45+ and seniors
 - c. personal perception by 45+ and seniors ("how good are our skills?", "how important and what we do use ICTs for?")
- A one to one comparison, of local level reports.

The Spanish team shall write a methodological introduction to the report.

Gabriella recommends to elaborate a "weak profile" from the local results by each institution. This profile would result of the consideration of the main

social-demographic features of our students (from (1) to (6)). For example, the weak profile for Spain would be females over 60 years, married, with certifications until Secondary..., and so on with the rest of institutions.

The Spanish team will send all the partners the files with the graphics and the excel file in order to complete all the reports (local and global). The distribution of tasks about this topic of the agenda will be decided at the end of the meeting.

Not scheduled on the agenda: **“Presentation of Google survey option” by G. Hirschberg (E-Seniors).**

Ganit Hirschberg shows how a survey can quickly be built using the Google survey tool, which is freely available on line. Multiple choice, or free text questionnaires can be built on line in a limited amount of time, using this tool. Similarly, answers to the questionnaire can be analysed using other options of the same tool. The tool can be used for several purposes. Jesus Delgado recommends to use this tool for the intermediate project evaluation. GH will make a questionnaire available on-line for this purpose.

Agenda item: “Intermediate project evaluation”

Gabriella Pappadà recommends to use some of the items from an evaluation questionnaire used in another of their projects.

The group discusses a set of questions designed for this intermediate evaluation questionnaire. The questions are finalised and gathered in a “static” version of the questionnaire, document which is attached as an annex to the present document. This questionnaire consists on 21 items organized in 6 sections (General objectives, work objectives, work satisfaction, work efficiency, quality of communication and Performance improvement). At the end of each section a free text questions for suggestions and comments will be available. This on-line questionnaire should be sent and filled at the end of May or beginning of June and the results will be discussed in the Florence meeting (June, the 17th 2010). The Google survey tool will be used for collecting the answers and computing the results by the French team (Ganit).

TUESDAY, APRIL THE 13TH 2010

Agenda item: “Current status of the website”

Jesus Delgado presents the web site and its status. Several improvements have been brought to the web site which now includes participative features.

Additional links to the reports, presentations and results will be added after the meeting.

It is also suggested that the work done by the students, such as perhaps a magazine, will be available on line.

The two senior spanish students present two magazines made by the seniors of Aula de mayores (U. de Málaga) and the Federation of the “aulas de mayores” of Andalucia.

As the translations in our different native languages are available of our website, Jesus Delgado recommends all partners to check if there is any mistake to be corrected, specially the information related to the contact data.

Some partners ask about the “visit counter” of the website and Jesus Delgado will ask about how it works to the Spanish colleague responsible of the website implementation and will inform about it.

Agenda item: “Activities with the students in Florence”

The next meeting will take place in Fiesole, which is accessible by local bus from Florence’s city centre. Fiesole has been chosen because of the presence there of a training centre for the +45 population, with additional facilities.

One of the activities suggested for the students in Florence is the production of a “magazine”. Contributions from students are also expected under the form of preparation work done before the meeting. These contributions could consist on informational reports about one topic related to the objectives of our partnership (for example, “ICTs against isolation after retirement”...) and / or personal experiences with ICT after +45 (for example, “How I got a better job by learning ICTs?”...). The students meeting in Florence should also have a workshop session, in which they would exchange about their practices by using presentations. In a short time, we will open a **forum** where each partner will explain in general terms what it will be the contribution of their students about in order to cover different topics / points of view of the objectives of our partnership. The more heterogeneous the topics showed by our students, the richer the results of the workshop in Florence.

The meeting will be on Thursday, the 17th June, all the day (It is strongly recommended to arrive in Florence the day before) and the students workshop on Friday, the 18th June in the morning. After the joint lunch the meeting will have concluded.

At the end of this item there was a very interesting debate about technologies and culture in relationship with the different ages of the human being.

Until the meeting in Florence, as it will be in a couple of months, any virtual meeting will be carried out.

Agenda item: "Meeting in Bulgaria"

The following meeting after Italy will be in Veliko Tarnovo (Bulgaria). The most appropriate date seems to be September the 30th and October the 1st 2010. All partners agree in this date. However, the Hungarian team will confirm if they don't have any problem with this date as soon as possible (as they need a couple of weeks to concrete the date of another project meeting). To reach Veliko Tarnovo the closest airports are Sofia and Varna.

The subjects to be covered in Veliko Tarnovo will also include:

1. pedagogical approaches and methods
2. good practices observed
3. new practices observed

As a start point of next academic year, more focused on teaching methodologies and good practices, and after a major focus on the students interests in this academic year, each partner will present a report covering these topics in their institution.

The following meeting will take place close to Budapest (Hungary) around February-March and the final meeting will be in Málaga (Spain) in June.

Jesus Delgado strongly recommends to be aware of the conferences that can take place in any of our cities while any of our meetings. It is really very important for the goals of our partnership to take part in dissemination events as we have already done in "Emploi des Seniors" at La Villette. Any suggestion in this line it will be deeply appreciated.

Agenda item: "Final overview and deadlines planning"

Jesus Delgado presents a final overview of the different parts of the project until this very moment of the partnership to the participants (planning and phases, cooperation and communication, evaluation, active involvement and integration into learning, dissemination...). After that it is decided the distribution of tasks and deadlines for the next months as follows:

<i>Tasks</i>	<i>Deadline</i>	<i>Responsible partner</i>
1) Questionnaire Local analysis	Florence Meeting (June, the 17 th 2010)	All partners separately
2) Comparative Questionnaire local analysis	One month after Florence (around July, the 17 th 2010)	Bulgaria and Spain
3) Questionnaire All institutions analysis	Florence Meeting (June, the 17 th 2010)	Hungary and France
4) La Villette Local Reports	One month after Paris (May, the 15 th 2010)	All partners separately
5) La Villette Final Report	Florence Meeting (June, the 17 th 2010)	Estonia and Italy
6) Intermediate Evaluation: - On-line implementation - fulfilment of question. - Results (Graphics) - Analysis of results	End of May, beginning of June 10 days after on-line implementation Florence Meeting (June, the 17 th 2010) Florence Meeting (June, the 17 th 2010)	France (Ganit) All partners separately France (Ganit) All the partners leaded by France (Discussion during the meeting)
7) Students presentations	Florence Meeting (June, the 18 th 2010)	All partners separately
8) Local Pedagogical Reports	Veliko Tarnovo Meeting (the 30 th September 2010)	All partners separately

Explanation of tasks:

- 1) Questionnaire Local analysis: Report analysing the 17 graphics resulting of the local questionnaires (nota bene: After the decision in Paris of crossing some data, maybe the number of resulting graphics will increase).

- 2) Comparative Questionnaire local analysis: Report comparing the 6 local reports (differences, similarities, conclusions...) compiling all the information in a unique report organized by chapters and including title page and index.
- 3) Questionnaire All institutions analysis: Report analysing the 17 graphics resulting taking into account all the institutions questionnaires together, compiling all the information in a unique report and including title page and index. It would be very positive to have the report a few days before Florence meeting to have some time to read it and promote the discussion during the meeting.
- 4) La Villette Local Reports: Written report compiling the information given in the conference "Emploi des Seniors" about the general topic "How seniors cop unemployment in our country?". Please, send to Jesus Delgado your reports before the deadline in order to have them available in the virtual space, especially for partners responsible of task 5).
- 5) La Villette Final Report: Report compiling the 6 national reports in a unique report organized by chapters and including title page and index, a general introduction and some conclusions. It would be very positive to have the report a few days before Florence to have some time to read it and promote the discussion during the meeting.
- 6) Intermediate Evaluation: as written in our application form, it consists on an evaluation for the first year of our partnership, where to check how our partnership is working until now and reach possible improvements for the coming academic year.
- 7) Students presentations: set of contributions for a magazine written by our students and showed in Florence. These could consist on informational reports about one topic related to the objectives of our partnership (for example, "ICTs against isolation after retirement"...) and / or personal experiences with ICT after +45 (for example, "How I get a better job by learning ICTs?"...).
- 8) Local Pedagogical Reports: The subjects to be covered in this report include:
 - pedagogical approaches and methods in my institution
 - good practices observed in my institution
 - new practices observed in my insitution

WEDNESDAY, APRIL THE 14TH 2010

Conference in the framework of Salon de l'Emploi des Seniors (from 10h00 to 12h00).

List of speakers:

Maria Teresa Vera
Balanza
Natalia Meléndez

University of Malaga Spain

Malavé		
Tanya Tsonkova	Intelekti	Bulgaria
Priscilla Várnagy	Net Mex	Hungary
Eero Elenurm	YSBF	Estonia
Gabriella Pappadà	FNP-CISL	Italy

Annexes (available in our virtual space).

Presentations made during the partners meeting and within the framework of the “Salon de l’Emploi des Seniors” conferences. (Paris, La Villette. 14th April 2010).

Addendum: intermediate project evaluation questionnaire.

Summary Sections

- General Objectives
- Work Objectives
- Work Satisfaction
- Work Efficiency
- Quality of communication.....
- Performance Improvement

General Objectives

- 1) How clear are the general objectives of the project? from 1 not clear at all to 5 totally clear
- 2) How clear are you on the relevancy of your work / tasks for these objectives?
- 3) How clear are you on your role / responsibilities in the project?
- 4) How clear are you on the role / responsibilities of other project partners?

Comments and suggestions (free text answer)

Work Objectives

- 5) Seeing the project as a whole, how integrated do you feel in the performance of the project? From 1 to 5
- 6) How different is now your view on the project as a whole in respect to how your originally envisaged it? from 1 to 5
- 7) How satisfied are you with the results that were achieved in the project so far? from 1 to 5
- 8) How appropriate are the tasks you performed until now to reach the objectives?. From 1 to 5

Comments and suggestions (free text answer)

Work Satisfaction

- 9) How satisfied are you with your tasks and work? from 1 to 5

10) How adequate are the task distribution defined for the project? From 1 to 5

Comments and suggestions (free text answer)

Work Efficiency

11) How efficient was your team work until today? 1 very inefficient to 5 very efficient

12) How efficient was the cooperation among partners? From 1 to 5

13) How appropriate was the scheduled time to fulfill my tasks properly? 1 not appropriate at all to 5 very appropriate

Comments and suggestions (free text answer)

Quality of communication

14) How clear was the communication among the members of the partnership? 1 to 5

15) How effective was the communication with the project coordinator? 1 to 5

16) How effective were the communication tools?

- Campus virtual (forum, documents repository, etc.)
- Seminario virtual
- Skype
- Website
- mailing list

17) How effective were the project meetings? 1 to 5

18) How effective were the virtual meetings?

19) How available was the information needed to carry out my tasks? 1 to 5

20) How appropriate was the discussion about the status of the project (problems, Delays, changes, organization)? From 1 to 5

Comments and suggestions (free text answer)

Performance Improvement

21) How well do you think the project is working until now? From 1 very bad to 5 very good

Comments and suggestions (free text answer)